

Date: Tue, 8 Jun 93 04:30:17 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #177  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Tue, 8 Jun 93                      Volume 93 : Issue 177

Today's Topics:

    Bad News For Blind U.S. Hams :-(  
        blind VEs (2 msgs)  
    carrying a copy of your license

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.  
-----

Date: Thu, 3 Jun 1993 19:11:52 GMT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!clark!pacifier!  
mikef@network.UCSD.EDU  
Subject: Bad News For Blind U.S. Hams :-(  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1uilnfINN41b@west.West.Sun.COM> flloyd@l1-a.west.sun.com (Fred Lloyd  
[Phoenix SE]) writes:

>>In article <1uenii\$nm@thumper.cc.utexas.edu> davros@thumper.cc.utexas.edu  
(Buddy Brannan) writes:

>>>

>>>The FCC has told a blind Advanced Class ham that he cannot administer VE  
>>>examinations because he's not able to "observe" the candidates, as per the  
>>>rules in Part 97 (this because of his blindness). Simple as that. His club  
>>>or whatever wouldn't let him help with their tests; he filed a discrimination'  
>>>complaint with the FCC, who took some time in reaching a decision. Their de-  
>>>cision was to say that the club was right in not letting this fella administer  
>>>exams.

>>>

>>>My personal view on this, as a blind Extra Class ham is that the FCC is wrong.

>>>Blind people can (and have) given exams (both as teachers and professors,  
>>>to sighted students and I'm certain as VE') for quite some time now. They have  
>>>done so successfully, since these teachers are still employed ... The fact  
>>>that these blind people are blind has not hindered their ability to "observe"  
>>>their surroundings. This is probably one of the silliest (and stupidest and  
>>>lots of other things) thing I've heard from the FCC in some time.

>>

>

>I'm having trouble understanding why this is "Bad News" for the blind  
>hams. Yes, it is probably a personal setback for the blind ham in  
>question but I would imagine that a great many other things in life  
>disappoint him as well. It's a fact of life that certain physical  
>disabilities preclude certain activities. All handicapped people are  
>aware of this, however, some refuse to accept it. And yes, there are a  
>great many things that the handicapped can do, frequently better than  
>able bodied people. On the other hand, there are some handicaps which no  
>matter how determined or dedicated the person may be, simply cannot be  
>overcome.

>

Somehow this has the ring of "some of my best friends are black ..."

Yes, there are limitations imposed by blindness. There are limitations  
imposed by youth, old age, gender, ethnic background, intellectual  
capacity, level of education, experience, temperament, etc. etc.  
Blindness is just a characteristic like any of these others  
(although you may find this impossible to swallow).

You say that there are just some limitations a blind person  
cannot overcome and you imply that these preclude one's becoming  
a VE. If we examine this carefully, we will note that the  
foregoing assertion is an **\*assumption\*** -- not a demonstrated  
fact. (I know of several blind VEs, one of whom is totally blind  
and caught cheaters). Fifty years ago, the FEderal government  
assumed -- by law -- that the blind were unfit for any Fedral  
jobs. It is often assumed that the blind cannot be scientists,  
engineers, machinists or even computer programmers (though this is  
rarer these days). Despite the demonstrable falsity of ththese  
assumptions, they continue. What's more important is that they  
**\*were\*** assumptions masquerading as facts. Witntess the many  
pamphlets in the field of work for the blind in the past outlining  
"those occupations that the blind can do". They limited  
opportunities for the blind not based upon experience but rather  
upon conjecture and lack of imagination.

For an exact analogy, consider that of African-Americans. At  
one time, it was considered that they were only suitable for  
menial labor. This is, of course, false. It is no different  
for the blind. With the possible exception of truck-driver

or fish-counter, blind persons are working successfully at most occupations which you can name (including Foreign Service Officer -- an occupation not without the need for judgment and assessment of character).

>

>The VE program was not designed to be a goal that amateurs aspire to  
>attain, it was designed to off-load work from the FCC, and to provide  
>more opportunities for exams to be held. If the blind ham wants to  
>become a VE solely for the purpose of enriching the hobby, there are  
>countless alternative ways in which this can be done. The blind hams  
>are not, in my opinion, being denied any significant opportunity to  
>further the hobby or cause of amateur radio.

>

The blind are being denied one of the opportunities granted them by their licenses for reasons having nothing to do with their qualifications to perform the required service. That's discrimination, pure and simple. Blind people are being denied the opportunity to help their fellow amateurs and the FCC -- a denial based upon uotworn and prejudiced notions of blindness.

African-Americans were at first denied the opportunity to serve in the Union Army during the Civil War. We know what Frederick Douglass should of this; he fought it for years until his eloquence (together with the need for more manpower) forced a change. We, the blind, consider this in the same way. We wish to serve; we're being prevented from doing so do to false notions of the incompetence of the blind.

>

>I would also add that the reference to blind university teachers has  
>some merit but one must consider the circumstances under which they  
>work and the environment in which they're in. Overall, a university is  
>typically a much more serious and presumably ethically conscious  
>setting than your average VE session. In the case of a VE exam,

I wonder. Any proffs care to comment upon the seriousness of the enviroment? How about the cheating scandal at Anapolis? Seems to me your analysis deflates like a balloon with a hole in it.

>literally anyone from off the street can come in, and take the test for  
>an amateur license. This contrasts greatly with the college student  
>who is fully aware that being caught cheating could ruin their entire  
>lifelong carreer. On the basis of value, an amateur radio license is  
>worthless compared to a college degree. It's a completely different  
>environment, and therefore invalid as a basis for comparison.

>

Blind merchants deal with customers off-the-street with little difficulty. If they (the merchants) get cheated, it's \*their\* income. I'd say that's a serious matter for them! They do quite

well, thank you. If they can do it, so can the blind VE.

>

>There are very good and valid reasons for the FCC to require that the  
>VE "observe" the applicant (or "testee" if you will). There can be  
>little doubt that countless numbers of individuals exist who would  
>waste no time in exploiting the examiner's inability to observe them.

>

I agree. It is up to the blind VE to devise alternative technique  
to solve the problem. It is not up to the FCC or the blind VE's  
fellow examiners to devise or evaluate those techniques. If there  
are problems, i.e., if it can be proven that a cheater wasn't  
caught and the blind VE was responsible, then he/she should have  
his/her VE status stripped as for anyone else in similar  
circumstances.

>It would be virtually the same as if one were to place applicants into  
>a closed room, shut the door and wait for them to come out. With all  
>of today's test questions being preselected, it becomes nothing less  
>than trivial to bring notes or "cheat sheets" into the exam session.  
>Such notes make no noise and are very inconspicuous to someone who  
>can't see them. Granted, the many of the so-called "legally blind"  
>could detect such behaviour, but the above complaint does not  
>distinguish among them and furthermore, makes no effort to exclude the  
>profoundly blind.

>

What makes you think the "profoundly-blind" couldn't catch such  
behavior? Apparently you've never been under the tutelage of  
a good blind instructor. Blind teachers work at all grade  
levels and in all sorts of schools in all areas -- from suburbs  
to the inner-city. Presumably they must successfully deal with  
cheating.

IMHO these objections to blind VEs are just excuses to cloak another  
manifestation of the age-old stereotype of the "helpless blind person".

Before you exclude the blind, why not *ask* them?

Curtis Willoughby is President of the ham group of the national  
Federation of the Blind. His call is KA0VBA and I believe his  
packet address to be "ka0vba@w0ak@ia.usa.na" Ask him.

>

>Turning one's head to such possibilities gives rise to a system which  
>is based completely upon honor, something which the FCC has never  
>successfully implemented. This can be witnessed by the requirement of  
>a minimum of three VE's to conduct a session, as well as a host of  
>other examples. If the FCC thought they could trust people, they would  
>just ask them to sign an affidavit attesting to the fact that they were  
>qualified and would be the end of it.

>

We would not want a system based upon honor, either. You assume

that with blind VEs, it would be. Your assumption is untested.

And speaking of honor, the whole VE system, IMHO, is, to a certain extent, an honor system. The minute the FCC relinquished the power to give exams, they relinquished some measure of control.

And, speaking of honor, isn't the assumption that one can send CW by having passed a receiving test somewhat of an "honor" thing?

>

>Sorry, but it doesn't work that way in real life. If the blind hams  
>want someone to blame for their loss of privlidge, I would suggest that  
>they look at their fellow man rather than the FCC. The requirement for  
>"observation" is a direct response to the lack of uniform ethics among  
>people in general. This trend is unlikely to change anytime soon.

>

You again assume that the blind cannot administer an exam.

Pardon me, but poppycock!

>

--

Mike Freeman		Amateur Radio Callsign: K7UIJ
301 N.E. 107th Street		Internet: mikef@pacifier.rain.com
Vancouver, WA 98685 USA		GEnie: M.FREEMAN11
Telephone (206)574-8221		Pushing 40 is exercise enough!

-----

Date: Thu, 3 Jun 1993 18:24:58 GMT

From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!clark!pacifier!

mikef@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: blind VEs

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <9306021332.AA03116@ucsd.edu>

William=E.=Newkirk%Pubs%GenAv.Mlb@ns14.cca.CR.rockwell.COM writes:

>

>>There is little that blind people cannot do when aided by the proper  
>>equipment. For example, at one startup firm where I worked, the  
>>purchasing agent was completely blind, yet was able to conduct business

>

>yeah, i would agree to a point, brian. but then again, i think you'd be able  
>to find people here that would swear the purchasing office IS blind from the  
>dumbo mistakes that they seem to be unable to prevent making. (yeah, the caps

a) Note the implication of the word "blind". Without thought you used the word in a context acceptable to society and common in English usage, that is, you used "blind" as a synonym for incompetence and stupidity. IMHO this bodes ill for any blind

person who might come to you asking for employment. Yes, I know that is not what you meant but our unconscious usage infiltrates our judgment. It does not surprise me, then, that you have grave doubts concerning the competency of the blind as VEs.

b) Most purchasing agents are sighted since most of the population is sighted. Does it not follow, then, that it is the sighted who should be barred from becoming purchasing agents? Makes about as much sense as barring blind VEs.

>

>in a fixed business you can install permanent features. we're  
>giving exams in an old classroom building (sorry, no wheelchair ramps in this  
>end of the building) and we count ourselves lucky to have a couple of duplex  
>power outlets to hook up the tape recorders and wireless headphone  
>transmitters.

>

a) What does being blind have to do with wheelchair ramps?

b) As a public accommodation, wouldn't it be a violation of A.D.A. to hold the exams in an inaccessible location over extended periods?

c) A reader doesn't require electrical power and many of the devices we use are battery-operated anyway and, in any event, it is our problem (i.e., the problem of the blind VE) to provide our own methods of solving the problem of functioning as a VE. You, the sighted, IMHO, bear no responsibility in this area and need not trouble yourselves about it.

>

>there may be solutions that would let a sightless individual act as a  
>volunteer examiner with the same level of performance as a sighted VE, but i  
>doubt they'd want to lug the stuff down to the exam site once a month.

>

That's not for you to decide! It's for the blind VE to decide. Anything else smacks of the benevolent paternalism that the blind (and the disabled in general) are struggling to abolish.

>

73!

--

Mike Freeman		Amateur Radio Callsign: K7UIJ
301 N.E. 107th Street		Internet: mikef@pacifier.rain.com
Vancouver, WA 98685 USA		GEnie: M.FREEMAN11
Telephone (206)574-8221		Pushing 40 is exercise enough!

-----  
Date: Mon, 7 Jun 1993 15:50:47 GMT

From: sdd.hp.com!spool.mu.edu!clark!pacifier!mikef@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: blind VEs

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <9306060726.AA03021@hwking.cca.cr.rockwell.com>

William=E.=Newkirk%Pubs%GenAv.Mlb@ns14.cca.CR.rockwell.COM writes:

>

>You must not have seen the part where I said my nearsightedness was  
>correctable....I also wasn't taking the stand that a blind VE could not serve  
>as the liasion, I had taken the more complete position (which is what the  
>current discussion is about if I understood the Amateur Radio Newsline report  
>correctly) that a blind person would have a very difficult time serving as a  
>VE, indeed. And that is what I believe is the question that's being discussed  
>here.

>

True enough. In it's letter, the FCC, in fact, encourages  
the blind person to take part in other aspects of the examination  
process. IMHO the quoted sentence to that effect is patronizing  
in the extreme but we'll leave that for another discussion on  
another day. The fundamental question, from the point of view  
of the FCC and radio amateurs is whether a blind person and,  
most especially, a totally-blind person, can be a VE. However,  
the question has implications far beyond amateur radio. It is,  
fundamentally, whether a blind person can conduct affairs that  
involve observations of people and judging of their integrity.

>

>Remember all VEs at a session are responsible for the proper supervision of  
>the examination. The VE rules require the administering VEs to be present and  
>observe the examinee throughout the entire examination.

>

Absolutely correct. This is quite proper. We blind amateurs are not  
arguing that the rules should be changed; they make perfect sense.  
What we are saying is that the interpretation that "observing"  
necessarily implies the sense of sight is discriminatory and,  
in fact, does not take account of the many blind persons doing  
work that requires \*just\* that sort of observation.

>

>The FCC says observe means you gotta be able to see.

>

And I say they're 100% out! I believe that they are in violation of  
Section 504 of the Rehab Act, as amended. The radio club in  
West Virginia very well may be in violation of WEst Virginia  
civil rights statutes. I believe that, were this incident to have  
taken place in Washington State, it would have been in violation  
of Washington State's Human Rights law. Federal law may  
supersede here, though, so we must IMHO go on the 504 complaint.  
The FCC has denied the blind prospective VE's 504 complaint  
so I suspect the whole matter will wind up in Federal  
District Court.

>

>This means that a blind VE (assuming that these reading machines work well  
>enough...) CAN be a Liaison or a Team Contact....but he CAN'T administer an  
>examination. He CAN make test materials. W5YI had even certified him (means  
>he was able to take the VE test..)

>

that is the implication of the ruling, sure enough. It is frightening  
in that, if it is allowed to stand, no blind person in a  
teaching position or testing position is safe.

>

>The beef is the folks in West Virginia don't want to work with him. They're  
>on the scene. I think their refusal to permit Moten to participate has to  
>carry some weight in this discussion (see Westlink Report #650, page 3 column  
>2 paragraph 2.). There could be other reasons they don't want to work with  
>him and are using 47 CFR 97.509(a) as the reason.

>

That may be. However, they should refuse to work with him outright  
rather than jeopardize the jobs and legal status of thousands  
of blind persons, not to mention trampling upon their civil  
rights.

>

>Of course, the Amateur Radio Newsline this week carries an interview with  
>Moten conducted by Hap Holly where Moten says he can see ... well  
>enough to claim that he would not have a problem with detecting cheating.

>

This clouds the issue, unfortunately. How much Mr. Moten can see  
, IMHO, should not be the issue since making it such concedes the  
point that sight is relevant to the examination process.

It is my contention that sight is irrelevant, presuming the  
blind VE is competent (meaning that he has devised alternative  
techniques to accomplish the tasks of a VE). If he/she is  
incompetent, than he/she has no business being a VE in the first  
place!

>

>so "blind" might mean that he's legally blind - won't be driving or flying  
>- but may not have to be equipped with readers, canes and seeing-eye dogs.

>

BTW, although blind persons using dog guides are usually proficient  
in the use of the cane, seldom does a blind person use both at  
the same time. Only in bad cartoons does this take place {grin}.

>

>So the FCC is holding you need good vision, the VE Team on the site refused  
>to let him proctor exams, Moten says he's blind. So it looks like Moten can  
>do everything he wants to do except actually handling running the exam itself.

>

Translation: Moten will be allowed to do everything but that which  
W5YI, an accrediting VEC, certified him as being qualified to do.  
And yes, Mr. Moten, you \*can\* help -- why you might even Braille the  
exams. Please stay in your place and don't bother us



anymore.

>

>I don't know if he's really got that strong of a gripe. Or if it's all just a  
>"personal problem".

>

Methinks I hear echos of some of the comments about Martin Luther  
KIng, Jr., James Farmer, Roy Wilkins, Ralph Abernathy, W.E.B.  
Dubois ...

>

--

Mike Freeman		Amateur Radio Callsign: K7UIJ
301 N.E. 107th Street		Internet: mikef@pacifier.rain.com
Vancouver, WA 98685 USA		GEnie: M.FREEMAN11
Telephone (206)574-8221		Pushing 40 is exercise enough!

-----

Date: Mon, 7 Jun 1993 12:45:04 GMT

From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!news-feed-1.peachnet.edu!concert!  
uvaarpa!murdoch!livia.acs.Virginia.EDU!jeg7e@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: carrying a copy of your license

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C88vtJ.1C2@hpbmqoea.sqf.hp.com> dstock@hpbmqoca.sqf.hp.com (David  
Stockton) writes:

>

> Just a curious point,

>

>

> If a licence is needed to move an amateur transceiver without  
>operating it, what about the aircrew who shipped it in from the land  
>where all these things are made? how did it pass customs? what about the  
>delivery driver ? the postman? a Tandy/RS shop where no-one has a  
>licence ?

The answer is obvious, while carried by these people the equipment is not  
installed nor in any other manner operational.

> There is some fine fuel there for navel-gazing style rule  
>interpretation discussions !

The true purpose of the hobby... Right? :)

> Who ? Me? stirring? never :-)

Gimme mine shaken, not stirred.

--

These opinions may not be unique, and they may not express the views of U.Va.

```
-----
| Jon Gefaell, Computer Systems Engineer \      /___ | SILENCE = DEATH
| Security and Technology Planning R&D    \    /  / | Hate is *NOT*
| I.T.C. Administrative Computing Services \  /   / | a Family Value!
| The University, UVA. Carruthers Hall    \\/   /  | -----
~~~~~\~~~~~ 73 de KD4CQY
```

-----  
Date: Fri, 4 Jun 1993 15:13:14 GMT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!clark!pacifier!  
mikef@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1u1lnfINN41b@west.West.Sun.COM>, <C80903.8Mr@ucdavis.edu>,  
<1u14a0INN492@topaz.bds.com>  
Subject : Re: Bad News For Blind U.S. Hams :-(

In article <1u14a0INN492@topaz.bds.com> ron@topaz.bds.com (Ron Natalie) writes:

>> All VE sessions I have attended included more than the minimum required 3  
>> VE's. I don't think anyone has suggested that blind VE's should give  
>> exams without the appropriate assistance. The point is that with the  
>> assistance of a reader and the other 2 VE's a blind amateur could easily  
>> discharge his or her duties.

>

>

>In at least the case of the ARRL/VEC, the three required amateurs are not  
>just their as body count to bless the proceedings, they are each individually  
>required to grade each exam, inspect the ID's, and review and sign the 610.  
>There's not any authority vested in the examiners to do otherwise.

>

That is as it should be. All we blind amateurs are asking is that we  
be given the credit, respect and responsibility for using our  
own techniques for performing these tasks. To do any less  
opens the door, legally-speaking, to massive job discrimination  
against the blind in numerous fields such as accounting (incidentally,  
there are many successful blind accountants).

>

>This isn't quite the same. Fortunately, the FCC and the VEC's give broad  
>leeway in accommodating handicapped applicants access to the hobby. The fact  
>that it bars them from performing in certain ancillary official capacities  
>is obviously deemed not as important.

>

Perhaps the FCC doesn't deem it important. The blind think  
otherwise.

>

--

Mike Freeman		Amateur Radio Callsign: K7UIJ
301 N.E. 107th Street		Internet: mikef@pacifier.rain.com
Vancouver, WA 98685 USA		GEnie: M.FREEMAN11
Telephone (206)574-8221		Pushing 40 is exercise enough!

-----

Date: Mon, 7 Jun 1993 15:49:20 GMT  
From: news.cerf.net!pagesat!ukma!rsg1.er.usgs.gov!resdgs1.er.usgs.gov!  
tbodoh@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1u10dl\$1no@hp-col.col.hp.com>,  
<1993Jun3.132405.20683@hemlock.cray.com>,  
<1993Jun5.221311.9608@n5ial.mythical.com>  
Subject : Re: carrying a copy of your license (WAS:

In article <1993Jun5.221311.9608@n5ial.mythical.com>, jim@n5ial.mythical.com (Jim Graham) writes:

|> In article <1993Jun3.132405.20683@hemlock.cray.com> dadams@cray.com writes:

|> >

|> >Right. But what if you are not operating the transmitter? Are you still

|> >required to meet the above?

|>

|> Well, I carry mine in my wallet, so it's not something I have to actually

|> think to remember...it's just always there.

|>

|> >What if you wife (non-ham) is driving your car to

|> >the store while her car is in the shop? (Assuming the radio is off.) Can she

|> >be arrested and the radio confiscated?

|>

|> Interesting (and certainly very valid) point....I'd be interested in

|> knowing if this has ever happened to anyone, and what the results were!

|>

|> --jim

|>

|> --

--

I wonder if the exemption for amateurs in the states that have scanner laws applies to the vehicle and radios or the amateur and radios? If the laws are worded like "Licensed amateur radio operators may operate..." this would seem to make it illegal to have the equipment in the vehicle while the vehicle is being driven in that state by a non-amateur - even if the amateur equipment is not in use. It would be helpfull to have this point clarified before someone ends up with their wife arrested and their radios

confiscated - the wife will come back home (to pack, anyway) but the radios would be goners! Anyone have a wife who is a lawyer that would like to test this? ;-)

Personally, I plan on carrying a copy in my wallet, taping one to the radio and having amateur plates in the hope of reducing the chances of even being questioned about it. Note that South Dakota is not the problem for me - it's Minnesota.

```
+++++
+ Tom Bodoh - Sr. systems software engineer
+
+ USGS/EROS Data Center, Sioux Falls, SD, USA 57198      (605) 594-6830      +
+ Internet; bodoh@dgg.cr.usgs.gov (152.61.192.66)
+
+ "Welcome back my friends to the show that never ends!" EL&P
+
+++++
```

-----

Date: Fri, 4 Jun 1993 15:05:57 GMT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!clark!pacifier!  
mikef@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <9306011608.AA16292@ucsd.edu>, <C80J9w.CCK@pacifier.rain.com>,  
<1993Jun3.155125.26333@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>  
Subject : Re: blind VEs

In article <1993Jun3.155125.26333@rsg1.er.usgs.gov> tbodoh@resdgs1.er.usgs.gov  
(Tom Bodoh) writes:

>  
>In article <C80J9w.CCK@pacifier.rain.com>, mikef@pacifier.rain.com (Mike Freeman)  
writes:

>|> If you're going down that road, you might as well ask me how  
>|> I do my taxes (I do the calculations and dictate the answers  
>|> to my reader or my wife) or how I fill out any of a dozen other  
>|> forms.

>  
>Does your wife call you a dictator like mine does to me?

>  
Upon occasion. Methinks it goes with the territory. OTOH  
it works the other way, too. Ever see the series "Rumpold of  
the Bailey" (or however one spells it) on PBS's "Mystery"? The  
protagonist refers to his wife as "She Who Must Be Obeyed"!.  
There are times when he has a point {grin}.

>

>|>  
>|> Ask us blind hams how we do things; we'll be glad to tell you.  
>|>  
>  
>Out of curiosity, how do you read your netnews postings and email? Do you  
>have a reader that converts text to synthesized voice? I take it that you  
>enter your news postings and email using a braille keyboard - or do you  
>know the keyboard by layout? Either way, I notice a lot fewer typos  
>in your postings than many other (assumed) sighted posters.  
>

Thank you very much for those kind words. I read my posts back  
after I've posted them and regretably find typeos that I wish I  
hadn't missed. But to your questions.

I log into a local dial-up UNIX box that has Internet/Usenet  
access using a computer (actually I have two) which have  
screen-reading firmware driving a voice synthesizer. Many, many  
blind persons have PC-compatibles with screen-reading TSRs  
driving speech synthesizers that use Telix, Procom, Commo, etc. etc.  
to log into machines with Internet access to interact with the  
world. I'm cheap; I'm using a couple of antiquated CP/M machines.  
Works the same, though.

As to typing -- some blind persons use Braille keyboards; I do when  
using a note-taking device known as a "Braille 'N' Speak"  
(Braille keyboard input, speech output) as a terminal. However,  
these are regular computers with regular keyboards that I'm  
using now. After all, in touch typing, you're not \*supposed\* to  
look at the keyboard anyway, are you? Didn't you have a typing  
teacher that either tried to cover the keys or rapped you on  
the knuckles when he/she caught you looking?

In other words, I type in the same way as everyone else -- only I'm  
forced to do it correctly {grin}!

Thanks for asking.

And now we return you to your scheduled topics {grin}.

>  
>|> 73!

--

Mike Freeman		Amateur Radio Callsign: K7UIJ
301 N.E. 107th Street		Internet: mikef@pacifier.rain.com
Vancouver, WA 98685 USA		GEnie: M.FREEMAN11
Telephone (206)574-8221		Pushing 40 is exercise enough!

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #177

\*\*\*\*\*